



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,943	01/05/2000	JE-HSIUNG LAN	WHOVIS.014A	9959

7590

02/25/2003

Mr. Howard Kline
Security First Corporation
22362 Gilberto, Suite 130
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

EXAMINER

AHMED, SAMIR ANWAR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 2623

1. The reply filed on 12/11/02 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): firstly, in two interview summaries dated 8/15/02 and 11/06/02, the Examiner requested that the Applicant review the claims which are replete with problems of dependencies, enablement and 112, 2nd (indefinite). The Applicant did nothing to solve these problems. For example, claim 1 recites a fingerprint sensor and claims 2-40 refer to an optical module, claim 1 does not recite anywhere "an optical module". Another example claim 43 that depends from claim 1, recites a system while claim 47 that also depends from claim 1 recites a method step of activating a light source. Another example claims 34-35, 37-38 that depends from claim 1 recite an optical lens that projected reflected light onto the detectors. Those claims are enabled by the embodiment of Fig. 17 of the optical module which only shows one detector 216 not plurality of detectors as recited in claim 1 which is enabled by a separate embodiment Fig. 2 which shows plurality of detectors 10. Those claims cannot depend from claim 1. Same argument for claim 36 which is enabled by a different embodiment shown in Fig. 20, that shows one detector 216 and claims 40-41 that are enabled by embodiment of Fig. 22, that also shows one detector 414. Secondly, Applicant selected claims 1-41 because claims 2-41 all depend from claim 1, which is not true because other claims currently depend from 1 (even they are wrongly depend from claim 1) such as claim 43, 45, and others. Claim 1 is a generic claim that reads on almost all the different embodiments of the optical module except the embodiments of Figs 17, 20, 22 that does not show a plurality of detectors in the optical module and the method and system embodiments and the dependent claims that depend from claim 1 represent

Art Unit: 2623

different and distinct species as shown by the different embodiments and Figs of the invention. For example claims 2-3, 6-11 represent a first species of the optical module shown in Fig. 2. Claim 4 is a different species shown in another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 4 claim 5 is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 3B, claims 12-18 is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 3A, claims 19-29 is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Figs. 5-7, claims 30-33 is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 14, claims 34-35, 37-38 (no enablement to depend from claim 1) is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 17, claim 36 (no enablement to depend from claim 1) is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 20, claim 39 is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 21, claims 40-41 (no enablement to depend from claim 1) is another species represented by another embodiment of the optical module shown in Fig. 22. The Applicant argues that there is no indication in the restriction requirements as to which claims the Examiner believes are directed to what inventions”, however the Examiner does not have to refer the claims to the embodiments of the species which is the Applicant’s job. However the Examiner in an attempt to help has shown some examples above for the embodiments of the species and the claims that reads on the species. The Applicant should review the rest of the claims and place them with claims of the proper species, the claims of a species should be enabled and their features are clearly disclosed


Art Unit: 2623

in the embodiment and the Fig. representing the species. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a). See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).**

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samir Ahmed whose telephone number is (703) 305-9870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au, can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 303-3900.

SA

2/13/03

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SAH', is written over a large, horizontal, oval-shaped line.

**SAMIR AHMED
PRIMARY EXAMINER**